



Week 2 Assignment: Mining for Data

Overview

In this week's lecture, we discussed the Texas accountability system and the Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) as a school improvement tool in relation to No Child Left Behind. This week, you will perform Step 2 of the comprehensive needs assessment, which you will use later to develop a campus action plan.

In this assignment, you will explore the Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) data, locate reports that are critical to your campus improvement team, and compare your selected campus' performance to AEIS standards. Your goal in completing this data analysis is to determine areas of strength and weakness and identify patterns and trends at your selected campus.

Rubric

Use the following rubric to guide your work.

Tasks	Accomplished	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Unacceptable
Week 2 Assignment: Mining for Data (ELCC 2.2 k-i, s-iv; 2.3 s-ii; 2.5 k-i, s-i, ii, iii, iv; 2.9 s-i, ii, iii, iv)				
Part 1: Campus Report Summary	Conducts detailed comparison of scores in each subject, subgroup, and grade level to the standards for Acceptable, Recognized, and Exemplary. (10 points)	Compares scores in each subject, subgroup, and grade level to the standards for Acceptable, Recognized, and Exemplary. (8 points)	Does not compare scores in each subject, subgroup, and grade level to the standards for Acceptable, Recognized, and Exemplary. (7 points)	Does not summarize Campus Report. (0 points)
Part 2: Campus Group and CI Report Summary	Conducts detailed comparison of scores in each subject, subgroup, and grade level to the standards for Acceptable, Recognized, and Exemplary. (10 points)	Compares scores in each subject, subgroup, and grade level to the standards for Acceptable, Recognized, and Exemplary. (8 points)	Does not compare scores in each subject, subgroup, and grade level to the standards for Acceptable, Recognized, and Exemplary. (7 points)	Does not turn in this portion of assignment. (0 points)
Part 3: Multi-Year History Report Summary	Successfully notes trends and/or patterns in campus AEIS data. (10 points)	Notes one trend and/or pattern in campus AEIS data. (8 points)	Does not note trends and/or patterns in campus AEIS data. (7 points)	Does not turn in this portion of assignment. (0 points)
Part 4: AEIS Chart Completion	Completes all applicable data in three AEIS Comparison Charts. (10 points)	Completes all applicable data in two AEIS Comparison Charts. (8 points)	Completes all applicable data in one AEIS Comparison Chart. (7 points)	Does not turn in this portion of assignment. (0 points)
Part 5: Area of Strength	Identifies one area of campus strength and two areas of weakness from AEIS data, and explains choices with detailed elaboration.	Identifies one area of campus strength and two areas of weakness from AEIS data, and explains choices with some elaboration.	Identifies one area of campus strength and two areas of weakness with no elaboration (7 points)	Does not turn in this portion of assignment. (0 points)

	(10 points)	(8 points)		
Mechanics	Few errors in grammar, spelling, or punctuation. (5 points)			Multiple errors in grammar, spelling or punctuation. Responses lack clarity and depth. (0 points)

Part 1: Campus Report Summary (ELCC 2.2 k-i, s-iv; 2.5 k-i, s-i, ii, iii, iv; 2.9 s-i, ii, iii, iv)

A critical skill for an instructional leader is the ability to use data-based decision making. You will practice this skill in this Application assignment as you collect data in preparation for creating an action plan for school improvement. In this section, you will select a school—ideally one in which you work—and review its AEIS data.

Directions

1. Navigate to <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/aeis>. On the left side of the Web page, select the most current AEIS data.
2. When the next screen appears, click “Campus Report” on the left.
3. Complete the form to select a campus and access a campus AEIS Report. Then click continue.
4. Print out the Campus Report.
5. Carefully review the data, and familiarize yourself with the format. Study Section I and Section II by row, title, and column heading so that you will know where to locate specific information.
 - Look for increases and decreases in the two-year comparison provided
 - Review each indicator on the report, and compare your campus performance on each indicator to the standards for Unacceptable, Acceptable, Recognized, and Exemplary ratings
6. Summarize your Campus Report findings in the workspace below.

Campus Report Summary Workspace

On the 2008-09 AEIS report for La Vernia High School (campus # 247903001), it is noted that the 2009 Accountability Rating is Recognized. It is also noted that the campus received Gold Performance Acknowledgements for College-Ready Graduates (Class of 2008) and Commended on Social Studies.

Please note that due to small numbers, results were masked for privacy (denoted herein by a * on the following tables) and not available for analysis for student groups African American, Native American, Asian/Pacific Islander and LEP; therefore no comparisons for these student groups can be made in this section of the assignment. As Special Education data is not available in all subjects and grade levels due to small numbers in some areas, they are not included in this section of the assignment, either.

Looking at the LVHS students who met the 2009 Standard for Grade 9, starting with Reading, we see that at the campus level, 95% of All Students met standard in 2009, slightly less than the 96% than met standard in 2008, but still exceeding the 91% who met standard at the State level in 2009. In looking at the student groups, 92% of Hispanic students met standard in 2009, down from 97% in 2008; 96% of White students met standard in 2009, slightly more than the 95% who met standard in 2008. 89% of the Economically Disadvantaged students met standard in 2009, up from the 86% who met standard in 2008. Based on these scores, all student groups in Grade 9 Reading in 2009 exceeded the 90% standard for Exemplary except for the Economically Disadvantaged; they scored an 89%, above the 75% Recognized threshold, but just missing the 90% Exemplary standard by 1 point. Overall, LVHS beat the state in all groups except for the Economically Disadvantaged, who are critical because they count twice in the ratings and are a primary target of NCLB improvement efforts.

Grade 9 Mathematics shows that LVHS has 80% of All Students meeting standard for 2009, up from 78% for 2008 and better than the State average of 71%. We find the highest mastery levels for White students at 82%, up from 79% in 2008, while the Hispanic students demonstrate 71% meeting standard (up from 70% in 2008) with only 69% of Economically Disadvantaged students meeting standard, up from 67% in 2008. While exceeding the 55% Acceptable rating standard in all groups, the 75% Recognized standard was only exceeded by White students, and no group came close to the 90% Exemplary standard. There is room for big improvements in Mathematics at Grade 9, especially for the Economically Disadvantaged who score a full 10 points behind the leading student group.

Next we examine the students at LVHS who met the 2009 Standard for Grade 10. Starting with English Language Arts at the campus level, 94% of All Students met standard in 2009, better than the 89% who met standard in 2008, and exceeding the 90% who met standard at the State level in 2009. Examining the student group scores, 87% of Hispanic students met standard in 2009, down from 92% in 2008; 95% of White students met standard in 2009, an improvement from the 88% who met standard in 2008; and 86% of the Economically Disadvantaged students met standard in 2009, the same as in 2008. Based on these scores, the White student group in Grade 10 English Language Arts for 2009 exceeded the 90% standard for Exemplary. The Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged scored above the 75% Recognized threshold. LVHS beats the state average only for White students, with further data mining needed to determine why Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged students are not achieving at the level as their White peers.

Grade 10 Mathematics shows that only 66% of All Students met standard for 2009, down from 75% for 2008 and below the State average of 69%. The highest mastery levels are for White students at only 67%, down from 79% in 2008. Hispanic students achieved 63% meeting standard (up from 56% in 2008), and alarmingly only 50% of Economically Disadvantaged students met standard, down from 61% in 2008. LVHS 10th graders exceeded the 55% Acceptable rating standard in all groups except for the Economically Disadvantaged, who scored a full 5 points below the Acceptable threshold. No group even approached the 75% Recognized standard. These scores raise a red flag for attention to 10th grade Mathematics, particularly for the critical Economically Disadvantaged students who are being left behind.

Grade 10 Science data shows LVHS All Students scoring 81% meeting standard in 2009, up from 79% in 2008 and well above the State level of 67%. White students achieved the best score at 86% meeting standard in 2009, up from 82% in 2008. Next best performance was for Hispanic students, 61% of which met standard in 2009, dropping from 62% in 2008. We again see a problem in the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students who dropped from 73% meeting standard in 2008 to 56% meeting standard in 2009. All groups exceeded the 50% Acceptable standard, while only White students exceed the Recognized standard of 75% by 11 points. The White student group was only 4 points shy of the Exemplary standard, showing a great disparity with their Hispanic and especially their Economically Disadvantaged peers. Whatever strategies are being used in 10th grade Science, they need to be significantly modified to bring the Hispanic and especially the Economically Disadvantaged students into parity.

In Grade 10 Social Studies, we see evidence of LVHS's Commended status. 93% of All Students in 2009 met standard, slightly below the 95% who met standard in 2008 but above the State average of 91%. Hispanic students increased from 83% in 2008 to 92% meeting standard in 2009, White students dropped from 95% meeting standard in 2008 to 93% in 2009, and the Economically Disadvantaged dropped from 90% in 2008 to 82% in 2009. Hispanic and White

student groups both exceeded the 90% Exemplary standard, while the Economically Disadvantaged students exceeded the 75% Recognized standard by 7 points. Social Studies is a subject the campus performs well in overall, although as a principal I would want to examine why there was negative growth for the White and especially the Economically Disadvantaged students in Grade 10.

Finally, we look at the students at LVHS who met the 2009 Standard for Grade 11. In English Language Arts at the campus level, 95% of All Students met standard in 2009, better than the 91% who met standard in 2008 and exceeding the 93% who met standard at the State level in 2009. Examining the student group scores, we find that 92% of Hispanic students met standard in 2009, up from 81% in 2008; 95% of White students met standard in 2009, up from the 92% who met standard in 2008. 94% of the Economically Disadvantaged students met standard in 2009, well above the 71% who met standard in 2008. Based on these scores, all student groups in Grade 11 English Language Arts in 2009 exceeded the 90% standard for Exemplary. Grade 11 ELA is an area of accomplishment that LVHS can take pride in for all student groups examined.

Grade 11 Mathematics shows that 85% of All Students met standard for 2009, up from 84% for 2008 and above the State average of 82% for 2009. The highest mastery levels are for White students at 88%, slightly down from 89% in 2008. Hispanic students achieved 70% meeting standard, up from 63% in 2008. Significant gains are evidenced for the Economically Disadvantaged students, 79% of whom met standards, way up from 48% in 2008. LVHS 11th graders exceeded the 55% Acceptable rating standard in all student groups for Mathematics, and exceed the 75% Recognized standard in the White and very important Economically Disadvantaged groups; the Economically Disadvantaged group exceed the Recognized standard by 4 points. The White student group was only 2 points shy of the Exemplary standard. Whatever strategies the campus implemented in Grade 11 Mathematics, they are clearly working, especially for the Economically Disadvantaged students.

Grade 11 Science data shows 95% of All Students at LVHS meeting standard in 2009, up from 89% in 2008 and well above the State level of 86% for 2009. Both White and Economically Disadvantaged student groups achieved the amazing score of 97% meeting standard in 2009, up from 90% of White students in 2008 and 77% of Economically Disadvantaged students in 2008. Hispanic students scored 87% meeting standard in 2009, up from 84% in 2008. All groups exceeded the 50% Acceptable standard, all groups exceeded the Recognized standard of 75%, and the White and Economically Disadvantaged groups exceeded the Exemplary standard by 7 points! Overall, there is cause for celebration based on the 11th grade Science data, particularly over the Economically Disadvantaged students exhibiting an improvement of 20 points in one year.

In Grade 11 Social Studies, we see additional evidence of LVHS's Commended status. 98% of All Students in 2009 met standard, up from the 95% who met standard in 2008 and above the State average of 97% for 2009. Hispanic students increased from 90% in 2008 to 92% meeting standard in 2009, White students increased from 96% meeting standard in 2008 to 99% in 2009, and the Economically Disadvantaged increased from 85% in 2008 to an astounding >99% in 2009. All student groups exceeded the 90% Exemplary standard, with the Economically Disadvantaged students exceeding the standard by over 9 points. No group examined exceeded the Exemplary standard by less than a margin of 2 points (Hispanic students), so Social Studies results for Grade 11 demonstrate a great program that is working well for all students and all student groups.

In summary, as a principal I would concentrate improvement efforts for the La Vernia High School in the subjects of Mathematics and Science, in that order, and would particularly redouble efforts to help the Economically Disadvantaged students receive the support they need to reach comparable achievement levels with their peers. I would also commend my Social Studies staff, and to a lesser degree my Reading/ELA staff, as it is critical to highlight areas of success while noting and addressing areas needing improvement. Significant gains were made in Mathematics and Science by the 11th graders, so the 11th grade teaching staff should also be recognized for a job well done.

Part 2: Campus Group and CI Report Summary (ELCC 2.2 k-i, s-iv; 2.5 k-i, s-i, ii, iii, iv; 2.9 s-i, ii, iii, iv)

Prior to completing this part of the assignment, review “Appendix F – Campus Comparison Group” in the Week 2 Reading *2009 Accountability Manual*.

Directions

1. Navigate to <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/aeis>
2. Select the most recent year's report from the column on the left. Next, click on “Comparable Improvement” (left column). In the text, click on the highlighted words “Campus Group and CI Report.”
3. Complete the form to select a campus and access a “Campus Group and CI Report.” Select PDF format because this is the format used on the TExES Principal Exam. Then click continue.
4. Print out the “Campus Group and CI Report.”
5. Carefully review the data, and familiarize yourself with the format.
6. Summarize your “Campus Group and CI Report” findings in the workspace below.

Campus Group and CI Report Summary Workspace

In examining the 2008-09 Campus Comparison Group report for La Vernia High School (campus number 247903001), we first see that LVHS has a lower percentage of White students (78.4%) than the group average of 79.3% of the population. LVHS has more Hispanic students (19.4%) than the group average of 14.1%, and slightly more Economically Disadvantaged students (18.7%) than the group average of 17.3% of the overall population. Mobility is exactly at the group average of 12.2%, there are more LEP students (1.7% for LVHS versus 1.3% for the group), but significantly fewer African American students as they make up only 1.1% of the 2008-09 student population at LVHS as opposed to the 3.8% average for the comparison group. This report is very telling, in that while districts and schools have a habit of comparing themselves to their neighbors down the road, none of the comparison schools are geographically contiguous to La Vernia ISD, and many of them are hundreds of miles away. In looking at these figures, my first concern would be that African American students could be easily overlooked in improvement initiatives as they constitute such a small percentage of the overall population; the same can easily be said for LEP students, despite the fact there are more LEP students at LVHS than the group average. In order to fulfill the promise of NCLB, these groups must have extra attention focused on them to ensure these students are performing at their potential and that their needs are being adequately and correctly assessed.

In examining the 2008-09 Comparable Improvement report for LVHS, we first see in Reading/ELA that 551 students were matched across the comparison period, very close to the group average of 556. The 2008 Average Scale Score was 2333, below the group average of 2367, and in 2009 the Average Scale Score fell to 2281 (the group average also declined to 2325). The 2009 Estimated Average Scale Score was 2309, again below group average of 2337. Progress was made on the 2008 Failer Average TGI (Texas Growth Index) as LVHS achieved a 0.64, better than the

group average of 0.54, demonstrating that students who failed to meet standard are improving and demonstrating growth, a hopeful sign if the trend can be maintained. Unfortunately, the 2009 Average TGI demonstrates negative growth at -0.28, worse than the group average of -0.13, so LVHS is digressing at a higher rate than the rest of the group, who on average also demonstrated negative growth in Reading/ELA. This negative growth translates to La Vernia High School being ranked in the fourth quartile due to the relatively high rate of negative growth. Therefore, LVHS cannot receive acknowledgement on the Comparable Improvement indicator, although it is otherwise eligible as the campus has a rating of Academically Acceptable or better (Recognized); the Texas Education Agency's 2008 Accountability Manual, Chapter 5, Gold Performance Acknowledgements, states that "For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus must have an average Texas Growth Index (TGI) within the top quartile (the top 25%) of their 40-member campus comparison group for Reading/ELA." (p. 55)

Examining Mathematics, we see that 547 LVHS students were matched across the 2008 and 2009 comparison period, close to the group average of 560. The 2008 Average Scale Score for Mathematics at LVHS was 2277, below the group average of 2292. The 2009 Average Scale Score was 2275, again lower than the group average of 2299. The 2009 Estimated Average Scale Score for LVHS was 2324, still below the group average of 2334. The 2008 Failer Average TGI demonstrated growth, with an index of 0.24 meaning that those failing to meet standard are improving, although not demonstrating as much relative growth in Mathematics as was evidenced by the higher growth rate in Reading/ELA; unfortunately, this improvement rate, while still showing growth, falls below the group average TGI of 0.40. Worse yet, the 2009 Average TGI for LVHS digressed to -0.38, performing worse than the group, who while losing ground had a lower TGI of -0.26. This again placed La Vernia High School in the fourth quartile and at a lower ranking in Mathematics than it held in Reading/ELA. Again, LVHS cannot receive acknowledgement on the Comparable Improvement indicator, although it is otherwise eligible as the campus has a rating of Academically Acceptable or better (Recognized); the Texas Education Agency's 2008 Accountability Manual, Chapter 5, Gold Performance Acknowledgements, states that "For acknowledgment on this indicator, the campus must have an average Texas Growth Index (TGI) within the top quartile (the top 25%) of their 40-member campus comparison group for Mathematics." (p. 56)

In conclusion, while scale scores dropped in both Reading/ELA and Mathematics at LVHS from 2008 to 2009, the ground lost is more significant in Mathematics, and the Failer Average TGI showed less improvement in Mathematics, meaning the students taking the Mathematics exam are not demonstrating improvement at the level of those in Reading/ELA. LVHS does not qualify for a Comparable Improvement Gold Performance Acknowledgement as it placed in the fourth quartile in both Reading/ELA and Mathematics.

Part 3: Multi-Year History Report Summary (ELCC 2.2 k-i, s-iv; 2.5 k-i, s-i, ii, iii, iv; 2.9 s-i, ii, iii, iv)**Directions**

1. Navigate to <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/aeis>.
2. On the left, click Multi-Year: Schools.
3. Complete the form to select a campus and access a campus "Multi-Year History Report."
4. Select the most current span of years in PDF format because this is the format used on the TExES Principal Exam. Then click continue.
5. Print out the "Campus Data Multi-Year History."
6. Carefully review the data, and familiarize yourself with the format.
 - Look for increases and decreases in performance by subject, grade level, and subgroups. Compare **campus** results with state, district, and campus group.
 - Note patterns and/or trends you see over time.
7. Summarize the patterns and/or trends noted in the data in the workspace below.

Multi-Year History Report Summary Workspace

In reviewing the multi-year history for La Vernia High School, from 2003-2009, the first trend I see for All Tests Taken, All Students is an increase for the campus of 39%, compared to the State change which increased by only 27% during this period. There was a positive growth trend from 34% meeting Recommended standard in 2003 to 73% meeting the standard in 2007; however, the percentage dropped to 71% in 2008, and returned to 73% in 2009, so despite the overall growth, there was negative progress for a year. Knowing the history of the campus, there was a change in leadership, with a new principal taking the reins in 2007 and reorganizing departments and reassigning teachers, possibly accounting for this brief dip in performance.

Although departmental reorganization might seem unusual in light of the All Students scores mentioned above, the need is apparent when we look at the student groups; on All Tests taken for Economically Disadvantaged students, there had been erratic performance with scores ranging from 20% in 2003, 46% in 2004, to 38% in 2005, so a big portion of the reorganization effort was focused on the student groups, with Economically Disadvantaged students ultimately achieving a 41% increase meeting Recommended standard during this period. However, there is still work to be done for the African American student group; their performance on All Tests Taken is all over the map, starting at 17% in 2003, 40% in 2004, 25% in 2005, reaching a high of 63% in 2007 but declining to 40% meeting Recommended standard in 2009; the results may be skewed, however, as these students constitute such a small population that we are looking at the performance of only a few individuals. However, NCLB is clear that we must find a way for *all* students to achieve, so this is unacceptable for even a handful of students to digress. As a principal, my top priority would be on focusing extra effort including differentiated instruction, embedded performance-based assessment and more frequent benchmarking on the student groups. More sources of data would need to be examined, however, as due to the small size of the African American student group, relatively limited data is available in subject areas of the AEIS Multi-Year History report as many columns are filled with only an asterisk to protect student privacy.

If we were to analyze the multi-year history to look for the smallest rate of campus change, hoping to find an easy way to focus change initiatives, we could be easily fooled. That is

because the lowest rate of change is in Social Studies, with no group increasing by more than 20%; in fact, for Hispanic Students, while the State increased by 24%, LVHS increased by only 20%, and for the Economically Disadvantaged, while the State increased by 25% during this period, LVHS students only gained 20%. This is a good example of why data mining skills and a thorough analysis are critical; while these facts are true, it would be easy to overlook that based on the actual year-by-year data, LVHS students always performed well in Social Studies, with the lowest group, the Economically Disadvantaged students, starting at 71% meeting Recommended standard in 2003, and ending at 91% meeting Recommended standard in 2009 despite the raising of the mastery standards during these years, making the test more rigorous. Overall, for All Students and all of the student groups, the percentage meeting the Recommended standard in 2009 ranged from 91% to 96%, demonstrating Social Studies is an area of strength for LVHS.

Looking at Completion Rate 1 data, there has been steady growth for All Students throughout the seven years of data collected, with 96.7% of All Students completing in 2009, a growth rate of +0.3% while the state declined, with a growth rate of -0.9% during this period. Highlights include a 100.0% Completion Rate 1 for Hispanic students in 2009, and Hispanic students outperformed all other student groups in 2007 as well. Unfortunately, Economically Disadvantaged students, who count twice in the rating system, continue to lag behind their peers; the overall campus change for this group during the 2003-2009 period was negative growth of -4.7%, while the State experienced only a -1.2% decline. Even though the Economically Disadvantaged students progressed from their lowest completion rate of 81.3% in 2004 to their current rate of 89.7% in 2009, progress has been erratic during this time and needs more sustained effort. White students also saw declining Completion Rate 1 scores from a high of 96.8% in 2007 to 95.8% in 2009, lower than even the 2006 rate of 96.2%. As a principal I would analyze more sources of data as part of a thorough investigation into the causes of the Completion Rate 1 declines for the White and Economically Disadvantaged students.

In summary, although student performance overall at La Vernia High School is at or above State rates, and many schools would envy our performance levels (particularly in Social Studies), the AEIS Multi-Year History report shows evidence that extra effort must be focused on the performance of the student groups, particularly the Economically Disadvantaged students who count twice. When comparing the subject areas, trends and scores demonstrate that Mathematics and Science, in that order, need the most attention focused on improvement efforts.

Part 4: AEIS Comparison Chart – All Grades Tested (ELCC 2.5 k-i, s-i, ii, iii, iv; 2.9 s-i, ii, iii, iv)

In the next section of the assignment, complete three charts using AEIS data: one for your selected campus; a second for a selected grade level; and a third for other campus factors.

Directions

In each of the four charts below, record the standard for performance on the AEIS base indicator. Next, measure your campus performance against the AEIS standard. See the Accountability Manual for the most current standards for each AEIS indicator.

For example, for a campus to be rated “Acceptable” according to 2009 standards, its students must score 70% on the Reading portion of the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS). Suppose your campus scored 65%. Then you would measure your campus against the standard by subtracting 65 (your campus score) from 70 (the Acceptable standard). There would be a difference of -5. In other words, your campus still has some work to do before it meets the standard. There are additional ways to achieve certain ratings under the Required Improvement (RI), Texas Projection Measure (TPM), and Exceptions rules that are addressed in the Accountability Manual, but for now, look strictly at the standards noted above.

For a campus to be rated exemplary, the campus must score at least 90% in all applicable areas. Suppose, however, that your campus scored 95%. Then you would measure your campus against the standard by subtracting 90% (the standard) from 95% (your campus score). The difference would be +5. In other words, your campus is exceeding the exemplary standard.

AEIS Comparison Chart: All Grades Tested

	Acceptable	Recognized	Exemplary
Base Indicators	Standard (varies by subject): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading: • Writing: • Social Studies: • Mathematics: • Science: 	Standard (same for all subjects):	Standard (same for all subjects):
TAKS (use most recent results & most recent standards criteria)	Standard – Campus Score = Difference <i>Example: 70 – 65 = -5</i>	Standard – Campus Score = Difference <i>Example: 75 – 65 = -10</i>	Standard – Campus Score = Difference <i>Example: 90 – 65 = -25</i>
Reading/ ELA	70%	75%	90%
All Students	70 – 95 = +25	75 – 95 = +20	90 – 95 = +5
African American	70 - >99 = +>29	75 - >99 = +>24	90 - >99 = +>9
Hispanic	70 – 91 = +21	75 – 91 = +16	90 – 91 = +1
White	70 – 95 = +25	75 – 95 = +20	90 – 95 = +5
Econ. Disadvantaged	70 – 90 = +20	75 – 90 = +15	90 – 90 = 0
Writing	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply
All Students	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply
African American	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply
Hispanic	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply
White	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply
Econ. Disadvantaged	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply

AEIS Comparison Chart: All Grades Tested (Continued)

Social Studies	70%	75%	90%
All Students	$70 - 96 = +26$	$75 - 96 = +21$	$90 - 96 = +6$
African American	$70 - *$	$75 - *$	$90 - *$
Hispanic	$70 - 92 = +22$	$75 - 92 = +17$	$90 - 92 = +2$
White	$70 - 96 = +26$	$75 - 96 = +21$	$90 - 96 = +6$
Econ. Disadvantaged	$70 - 91 = +21$	$75 - 91 = +16$	$90 - 91 = +1$
Mathematics	55%	75%	90%
All Students	$55 - 77 = +22$	$75 - 77 = +2$	$90 - 77 = -13$
African American	$55 - *$	$75 - *$	$90 - *$
Hispanic	$55 - 69 = +14$	$75 - 69 = -6$	$90 - 69 = -21$
White	$55 - 80 = +20$	$75 - 80 = +5$	$90 - 80 = -10$
Econ. Disadvantaged	$55 - 68 = +13$	$75 - 68 = -7$	$90 - 68 = -22$
Science	50%	75%	90%
All Students	$50 - 88 = +38$	$75 - 88 = +13$	$90 - 88 = -2$
African American	$50 - *$	$75 - *$	$90 - *$
Hispanic	$50 - 75 = +25$	$75 - 75 = 0$	$90 - 75 = -15$
White	$50 - 92 = +42$	$75 - 92 = +17$	$90 - 92 = +2$
Econ. Disadvantaged	$50 - 76 = +26$	$75 - 76 = +1$	$90 - 76 = -14$

AEIS Comparison Chart: Grade Level

For this portion of the assignment, select a grade level at your campus.

	Acceptable	Recognized	Exemplary
Base Indicators	Standard (varies by subject): Reading: Writing: Social Studies: Mathematics: Science:	Standard (same for all subjects):	Standard (same for all subjects):
TAKS (use most current AEIS data & standards)	Standard – Grade Level = Difference	Standard – Grade Level = Difference	Standard – Grade Level = Difference
Reading/ ELA	Grade 11 70%	Grade 11 75%	Grade 11 90%
All Students	70 – 95 = +25	75 – 95 = +20	90 – 95 = +5
African American	70 - *	75 - *	90 - *
Hispanic	70 – 92 = +22	75 – 92 = +17	90 – 92 = +2
White	70 – 95 = +25	75 – 95 = +20	90 – 95 = +5
Econ. Disadvantaged	70 – 94 = +24	75 – 94 = +19	90 – 94 = +4
Writing	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply
All Students	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply
African American	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply
Hispanic	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply
White	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply
Econ. Disadvantaged	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply

AEIS Comparison Chart: Grade Level (Continued)

Social Studies	Grade 11 70%	Grade 11 75%	Grade 11 90%
All Students	$70 - 98 = +28$	$75 - 98 = +23$	$90 - 98 = +8$
African American	$70 - *$	$75 - *$	$90 - *$
Hispanic	$70 - 92 = +22$	$75 - 92 = +17$	$90 - 92 = +2$
White	$70 - 99 = +29$	$75 - 99 = +24$	$90 - 99 = +9$
Econ. Disadvantaged	$70 - >99 = +>29$	$75 - >99 = +>24$	$90 - >99 = +>9$
Mathematics	Grade 11 55%	Grade 11 75%	Grade 11 90%
All Students	$55 - 85 = +30$	$75 - 85 = +10$	$90 - 85 = -5$
African American	$55 - *$	$75 - *$	$90 - *$
Hispanic	$55 - 70 = +15$	$75 - 70 = -5$	$90 - 70 = -20$
White	$55 - 88 = +33$	$75 - 88 = +13$	$90 - 88 = -2$
Econ. Disadvantaged	$55 - 79 = +24$	$75 - 79 = +4$	$90 - 79 = -11$
Science	Grade 11 50%	Grade 11 75%	Grade 11 90%
All Students	$50 - 95 = +45$	$75 - 95 = +20$	$90 - 95 = +5$
African American	$50 - *$	$75 - *$	$90 - *$
Hispanic	$50 - 87 = +37$	$75 - 87 = +12$	$90 - 87 = -3$
White	$50 - 97 = +47$	$75 - 97 = +22$	$90 - 97 = +7$
Econ. Disadvantaged	$50 - 97 = +47$	$75 - 97 = +22$	$90 - 97 = +7$

AEIS Comparison Chart: Other Factors

	Acceptable	Recognized	Exemplary
Base Indicators	Standard:	Standard:	Standard:
TAKS (use most current AEIS data & standards)	Standard – Campus Score = difference	Standard – Campus Score = difference	Standard – Campus Score = difference
Completion Rate (High School)	75%	85%	95%
All Students	75 – 96.7 = +21.7	85 – 96.7 = +11.7	95 – 96.7 = +1.7
African American	75 - *	85 - *	95 - *
Hispanic	75 – 100 = +25	85 – 100 = +15	95 – 100 = +5
White	75 – 95.8 = +20.8	85 – 95.8 = +10.8	95 – 95.8 = +0.8
Econ. Disadvantaged	75 – 89.7 = +14.7	85 – 89.7 = +4.7	95 – 89.7 = -5.3
Base Indicators	Standard:	Standard:	Standard:
TAKS (use most current AEIS data & standards)	Standard – Campus Score = difference	Standard – Campus Score = difference	Standard – Campus Score = difference
Dropout Rate (Grades 7 & 8)	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply
All Students	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply
African American	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply
Hispanic	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply
White	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply
Econ. Disadvantaged	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply
Base Indicators	Standard:	Standard:	Standard:
TAKS (AEIS reports the previous year's attendance rate)	Standard – Campus Score = difference	Standard – Campus Score = difference	Standard – Campus Score = difference
Attendance Rate	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply

Part 5: Area of Strength (ELCC 2.2. k-i, s-i, iv; 2.5 k-i, s-i, ii, iii, iv; 2.9 k-i, s-i, ii, iii)

In part 4, you completed the AEIS Comparison Charts to record your school's scores and compare them to the standards for each AEIS rating by computing the difference between the standard for Acceptable, Recognized, and Exemplary in each subject, grade, and subgroup. Next, you will use the data to determine areas of strength and weakness at the campus. In a later assignment, you will use the data to build an action plan for school improvement.

Directions

1. Use the AEIS Comparison Charts to target one area of strength and two areas of weakness at the campus.
2. In the workspace below, briefly explain why you chose each area of strength and weakness.

Identified Area of Strength	Why I Chose It
1. Grade 11 Social Studies, All Students and All Student Groups Analyzed	Grade 11 Social Studies clearly stands out as an area of strength from all the data analyzed during this exercise. Not only does LVHS rate Exemplary for All Students in this grade level and subject area, exceeding the required 90% Exemplary standard by 8 points, but in every student group analyzed, the Exemplary standard is exceeded by at least 2 points (Hispanic students) or better. When compared to the State, which scored 97% in 2009, LVHS scored 98% for All Students, surpassing the State by 1%. It is particularly worth noting that even the Economically Disadvantaged students scored greater than 9 points above the 90% Exemplary standard, and above the state average.

Identified Area of Weakness	Why I Chose It
1. Mathematics, All Grades Tested	The greatest area of weakness identified for LVHS by the preceding data analysis is Mathematics for All Grades Tested. Although All Students and all student groups exceeded the 55% Acceptable standard by a margin of at least 13 points minimum (Economically Disadvantaged), the Recognized standard of 75% was exceeded only by the All Students group (by just 2 points) and the White students group (by 5 points). The Hispanic and

	Economically Disadvantaged students failed to meet the Recognized standard by at least 6 points, and no group approached Exemplary status, with Economically Disadvantaged students failing to meet the Exemplary standard by a deficit of 22 points. There are clear indications, based on these test results, that improvement efforts need to be concentrated on Mathematics in general at the high school, with special effort focused on Mathematics for the Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged student groups.
2. Science, All Grades Tested	Science for All Grades Tested is another area where improvement efforts need to be focused at LVHS. However, in this case the concern is raised by the disparity in performance between the White student group, who actually exceed the Exemplary standard of 90% by 2 points, and the performance of the Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged student groups, who barely reached the Recognized standard. This is of particular concern for the Economically Disadvantaged group, whose students lagged behind the White students by 16 points; this is a crucial gap as the Economically Disadvantaged students count twice in the Accountability Ratings. Detailed analysis of teaching practices and student performance on benchmark tests for Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged students must be performed to determine why these students are not achieving at the same level as the White students.

E-portfolio assignment:**Complete “II-004 Curriculum, Measurement, and Alignment of Resources”
Course-Embedded Log 1.**

Continue to complete and post Campus-Supervised reflection logs in the e-portfolio. All Course-Embedded and Campus-Supervised logs must be completed by your 11th course in the program prior to the EDLD 5398 Internship course.